

STATE LAND USE PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL

MINUTES

January 30, 2009

At the following location:

Carson City Community Center
Sierra Room,
851 E. William Street (US 50)
Carson City, NV 89701

Members Present

Pete Livermore, Carson City
Nancy Lipski, Clark County
Varlin Higbee, Lincoln County
Don Tibbals, Lyon County
Glen Bunch, Mineral County
Butch Borasky, Nye County
Eleanor Lockwood, Churchill County
Mickey Yarbro, Lander County

Robert Conner, Douglas County
Robin Bell, White Pine County
Sheri Eklund-Brown, Elko County
Tom Fransway, Humboldt County
Roger Mancebo, Pershing County
Bill Whitney, Washoe County

Members Absent

Bill Kirby, Esmeralda County
Robert Kershaw, Storey County
(Vacant), Eureka County

Others Present

Jim Lawrence, Nevada Division of State Lands
Charlie Donohue, Nevada Division of State Lands
Skip Canfield, AICP, Nevada Division of State Lands (State Land Use Planning Agency)
Juan Guzman, Carson City Parks and Recreation, Open Space Program
Mark D. Kimball, Nye County
Alice Baldrice, State Historic Preservation Office
Kevin Hill, Nevada Division of State Lands, Question 1 Program
Mike Harper, Washoe County

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Mancebo called the meeting to order at 9:05 AM and asked for self introductions. Upon completion, he asked for any corrections to the agenda. There being none, they were approved.

Chairman Mancebo called for any corrections to the July 21, 2008 meeting minutes. **Mr. Conner** moved for approval, seconded by **Mr. Borasky**, the motion carried unanimously.

AGENCY REPORT

Mr. Lawrence focused his portion of the Agency Report on the budget issue and how it affects the Nevada Division of State Lands (NDSL) and more specifically, the State Land Use Planning Agency (SLUPA). **Mr. Lawrence** noted that the proposed budget cuts are, and will affect the level of services provided by SLUPA to local counties. One of the two professional planner positions at SLUPA has been eliminated. This reduction in staffing has resulted in the need to prioritize what services SLUPA can provide. The prioritization resulted in the designation of three tiers of SLUPA services:

First Tier – Essential Services

- Nevada State Clearinghouse coordination

Nevada Division of State Lands

State Land Use Planning Agency
901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5003
Carson City, Nevada 89701-5246

Telephone: (775) 684-2723
Fax: (775) 684-2721

- Federal land issues facilitation
 - Briefing Sessions
 - Land Bills
- Public Land Policy Plan development and facilitation
- "Laws Relating to Planning" publication
- State Land Use Planning Advisory Council organization and facilitation
- Mt. Charleston License Plate Grant Program administration and facilitation
- National Guard land use planning assistance and facilitation

Second Tier – Important

- Provision of technical assistance
 - Master plan and ordinance development
 - Training sessions
- "Directory of Local Planning Organizations" publication
- "Planners' Guide" publication

Third Tier

- Participation in "ad hoc" committees
 - I-80 Corridor planning committee
 - US 50 Corridor planning committee
- Annual Rural Nevada Planning and Natural Resources Conference

Tom Fransway asked how the budget cuts are or will affect the Question 1 Program. **Mr. Lawrence** responded that the Question 1 budget does not come out of the general fund, so is not directly affected. However, an indirect effect could possibly be a reduction in efficiency. **Charlie Donohue** added that NDSL's land agents support the Question 1 Program. One land agent position had been cut from the agency. Therefore, it may take more time to conduct business at the agency.

Chairman Roger Mancebo asked if it would be prudent to keep SLUPAC meetings only in Carson City. **Mr. Lawrence** responded that keeping the SLUPAC meetings in Carson City would help the travel budget. However, it is important to SLUPA to get out and have meetings in other locations.

Vice Chair Sheri Eklund-Brown asked if there was any potential for the Question 1 budget to be moved into the general fund. **Mr. Lawrence** responded "no", the Question 1 funds are derived from voter-approved bonds. **Ms. Eklund-Brown** also stressed the importance of partnering with other entities to put on the conference.

Robert Conner asked if local counties could assist in the annual conference. He also asked if there could be partnering with other conferences. **Mr. Lawrence** responded that those were both very good ideas that would be looked into.

Bill Whitney commented that SLUPA could look into partnering with the Nevada American Planning Association conference.

Eleanor Lockwood asked if SLUPA/NDSL is involved in NDEP air quality planning, and if SLUPA could assist the local counties in air quality planning. **Mr. Lawrence** said that staff would look into this matter.

Robert Conner requested someone from NDEP to come to the next SLUPAC meeting and talk about their program on air quality planning.

Skip Canfield AICP continued the agency report and discussed ongoing SLUPA activities. **Mr. Canfield** provided the SLUPAC members with the 2009 SLUPA report to the Legislature. Details of the report follow.

Local Public Lands Policy Plan Updates (NRS 321.7355)

▪ White Pine County Public Lands Policy Plan

SLUPA assisted the White Pine County Public Land Use Advisory Committee (PLUAC) in updating the White Pine County Public Lands Policy Plan and it was adopted by the White Pine County Commission in August, 2007.

▪ Elko County Public Lands Policy Plan

SLUPA assisted the Elko County Public Land Use Advisory Commission (PLUAC) in updating the Elko County Public Lands Policy Plan and it was adopted by the Elko County Commission in December, 2008.

▪ Lincoln County Public Lands Policy Plan

SLUPA initiated the update to the Lincoln County Public Lands Policy Plan in October, 2008. A newly-created PLUAC is now working with SLUPA on a monthly basis and a final product suitable for presentation to the County Commission is anticipated by Fall 2009.

▪ Esmeralda County Public Lands Policy Plan

SLUPA initiated the update to the Esmeralda County Public Lands Policy Plan in March, 2008. A newly-created PLUAC is now working with SLUPA on a monthly basis and a final product suitable for presentation to the County Commission is anticipated by Fall 2009.

▪ Mineral County Public Lands Policy Plan

SLUPA initiated the update to the Mineral County Public Lands Policy Plan in November, 2008. A newly-created PLUAC will begin working with SLUPA soon and a final product suitable for presentation to the County Commission is anticipated by Spring 2010.

Congressional Land Bills

NDSL maintains a positive working relationship with Nevada's Congressional delegation staff in matters related to new land acts in the state. This relationship is strengthened by an open and efficient dialogue that is maintained with the federal planning partners.

SLUPA, in partnership with the Congressional delegation, has helped with the coordination of federal and state agencies, local governments and interest groups as county land bills are proposed and developed. SLUPA has taken the lead role in facilitating State agency briefings to gather input. SLUPA prepares unified State response letters that are provided to the Governor's office for final editing, approval, and distribution to the Congressional delegation.

In the last two years, SLUPA has coordinated with Lyon, Mineral and Esmeralda Counties regarding proposed land bills that would have affected all three counties. Of most importance to SLUPA was the provision of facilitation and technical assistance to help the counties address land use and natural resource planning needs as a result of the bills. Based on opposition and comments received from local governments the bills are currently on hold.

In addition, SLUPA participated in the development of the 2009 Carson City Vital Community Act, currently under final approval in Congress, as part of a much more wide-ranging bill affecting a number of states. For Carson City, the most notable effect will be a reorganization of land use ownership patterns between Carson City, BLM and the US Forest Service. The new pattern will result in a more logical management ability for all three entities.

The trend of utilizing Congressional acts on a county level in Nevada will continue. Already, other counties are looking at the feasibility of pursuing land bills. When and if more counties do undertake this task, SLUPA will be an integral partner in the process.

SLUPA Collaborative Planning Involvement

The BLM Resource Advisory Councils (RACs), the Tri County Working Group, as well as other venues such as the Joint Military Affairs Committee (JMAC) are effective means to gather productive comments and foster transparent dialogue. NDSL values these partnerships and strives to maintain an active presence. These venues are extremely valuable resources for State agencies and the local governments to stay apprised of land use and natural resource activities occurring statewide, both on public and private lands. SLUPA's Senior Planner represents the State on one of the three RACs, the Mojave-Southern Great Basin RAC.

Nevada State Clearinghouse

The Nevada State Clearinghouse is the most efficient manner in which State agencies stay connected to public lands-related activities. The "single point of contact" role of the Clearinghouse is vital in how SLUPA comments on actions proposed for public lands. In a given year, SLUPA reviews an average of 150 Clearinghouse items and at least one third of those require in depth analyses, dialogue and collaboration with our sister agencies, federal and local governments, stakeholders and other interested publics.

Some of the many notable Clearinghouse projects SLUPA has commented on include:

- Scoping for BLM Winnemucca District RMP update.
- Coordinated with Mojave Southern Great Basin RAC to review and provide comments on BLM Ely District RMP update.
- Coordinated with local governments on comments to the Southern Nevada Water Authority's proposed groundwater importation project.
- EIS Virgin and Muddy Rivers surface water development.
- US Forest Service Roadless Policy, travel management planning and Forest Plan revisions.
- Provided comments on multiple Notice of Reality Actions (NORAs) in the Las Vegas Valley and how those sales affect State needs for land and Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) needs.
- Lake Mead NRA General Plan Amendments.
- Wilderness Management Plan review for new wildernesses in White Pine and Lincoln Counties.
- EIS for US Forest Service Middle Kyle Complex project.
- US Forest Service Santa Rosa - EIS for travel management project - roads identification.
- Recreation Management Plan for Ash Springs.
- EIS for Lincoln County Groundwater Development project.

Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act of 1998 (SNPLMA)

NDSL plays an active role in the implementation of the SNPLMA. The Administrator has represented the State on the SNPLMA Partners Working Group which reviews proposals for the expenditure of SNPLMA funds, including nominations for the federal acquisition of sensitive lands statewide. The Deputy Administrator represents the State on the Lands Acquisition subcommittee that reports to the Working Group. Also, SLUPA works directly with local governments to ascertain local needs, concerns and issues. SLUPA strives to promote transparent and efficient public dialogue.

The act was amended to allow expenditure of SNPLMA funds to implement the Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program; the Administrator also represents the State on the Tahoe Working Group, which reviews proposals for project funding.

Nevada Rural Planning and Natural Resources Conference

Since 1970, SLUPA staff has hosted a series of land use planning conferences which address a variety of land use issues, including issues relating to public lands. The most recent Rural Planning and Natural Resources Conference was held in Ely in 2007. The conference was extremely successful with over 100

participants from all interests. In addition to a vital networking and learning experience for the participants and SLUPA, a number of pertinent assistance requests were received that can be provided by SLUPA, including requests for assistance in updating local public lands policy plans.

Other Public Lands-Related Activities

During the past two years, SLUPA staff has assisted a number of local governments and other organizations on public land-related activities. For example:

- SLUPA strives to participate in meetings of the Public Land Use Advisory Planning Commissions (PLUACs), BLM Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) and both local and state collaborative efforts (e.g. Tri County Working Group, Northeast Nevada Stewardship Group, Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition, and Partners in Conservation). Participating enables SLUPA to stay in the loop on public lands issues important to all Nevadans.
- SLUPA staff attends a number of public lands-related conferences statewide and nationally in an effort to network both regionally and nationally on important land use related activities.
- Other miscellaneous activities including responding to phone calls, research, and participating in federal agency scoping and coordination meetings.

State Land Use Planning Advisory Council

The State Land Use Planning Advisory Council (SLUPAC, NRS 321.740) meets quarterly. Although the focus of SLUPAC is on matters related to local land use planning, including master planning and zoning, many topics are specifically related to public lands due to the planning and demographic makeup of the state. SLUPAC meetings are a unique opportunity to hear the concerns and issues of Nevada's counties on public lands issues because it is the only entity advising SLUPA and the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources with representatives from each of Nevada's seventeen counties. SLUPA serves as staff to SLUPAC and performs such duties as research on issues, preparation of agendas and minutes and any other requirements of the open meeting law and hosting of the meeting.

Over the past two years, SLUPAC has heard many public lands related agenda items. The meeting topics included:

- Development activities in Lyon County
- Clark County Airport Environs Master Plan Element
- Army Corps of Engineers Navigable Waters Issues
- Review of Planning-Related Legislation for the 74th Session of the Nevada Legislature
- Soda Lake Question One Grant
- Dedication of Water Rights as a Condition of Development
- Flood Plain Management Tools
- Presentations on Pending Public Lands Bills
- Land Use and Water Availability
- Wildland/Urban Interface
- Nemo-Non Point Water Pollution Control
- Split Estate and Railroad Grant Lands
- Central Nevada Water Authority
- Energy Projects in Nye County

Mt. Charleston License Plate Grant Program

The Mount Charleston License Plate fund (NRS 321.5959) is administered by SLUPA for projects and programs that support the natural environment of Mount Charleston. These funds are available as grants and must be used for:

- *The support of programs for the natural environment of the Mount Charleston area, including, without limitation, programs to improve the wildlife habitat, the ecosystem, the forest, public access to the area and its recreational use, and must not be used to replace or supplant money available from other sources. The Administrator may provide grants from the account to other public agencies and political subdivisions, including, without limitation, unincorporated towns, to carry out the provisions of the program.*

SLUPA received six project requests during Round 1 of the program in Fall 2008 and all were approved after review by a Technical Advisory Committee. The total grant award for all six projects amounted to \$107,658.69, which includes a 3% allowance for administrative purposes that is in addition to the grant award. Five of the projects are on the Clark County side of the range and the sixth is on the Pahrump side, and can be summarized as follows:

Mt. Charleston Communities Fire Hydrant Marker Flags

Grant Award: \$ 1,793.00

- This project proposes the placement of reflective metal poles and flags on top of fire hydrants for better visibility in the Mt. Charleston communities.

Mt. Charleston Community Gateways Design Project

Grant Award: \$25,000.00

- The Mt. Charleston communities are directly adjacent to US Forest Service lands and frequently experience problems with visitors who are not able to distinguish private lands from public lands. These visitors end up inadvertently trespassing. The communities want to encourage visitation while protecting privacy. Public lands officials are often unable to properly address the situation as well.
- The project seeks to support a partnership between private land owners and the US Forest Service that will use environmental/public art to more clearly delineate public lands from private lands. The project is called "Gateways" but may manifest itself in other ways as the partners develop environmentally-pleasing artwork that helps define these public/private boundaries.

Mt. Charleston Birding Brochures and Guided Walks

Grant Award: \$14,700.00

- The Red Rock Audubon Society proposes a 2-part educational outreach effort. Part 1 would be to publish a full color brochure checklist of the 226 birds commonly associated with Mt. Charleston. Part 2 would consist of a series of educational field tours led by experienced Audubon leaders who have extensive knowledge of local birds, as well as plants and trees.

Keeper of Wheeler Well

Grant Award: \$13,030.00

- Educational program based on the story of Dick Senior ("Keeper of Wheeler Well"), who has dedicated considerable time to the rehabilitation and maintenance of an important water source on the west flank of the Spring Mountains, east of Pahrump. Artists and educators will be employed to tell his story of stewardship and its link to the importance of water to wildlife and the ecosystem. Elementary schools will receive a final "reading program", presented by the artists, and assisted by Forest Service staff, and possibly coordinated with Earth Day activities. High school interns will learn to present the program so the project is maintained in future years.

Mt. Charleston Wilderness Stewardship Program

Grant Award: \$ 25,000.00

- Through partnerships, wilderness stewardship will be promoted by the Wilderness Outreach and Education Program. The program will help visitors understand wilderness areas, foster stewardship

of the land and to practice “Leave No trace” ethics during their visits. A coordinator will work with surrounding communities and coordinate the volunteer program as well as special outreach events.

Mt. Charleston OHV Host Program

Grant Award: \$25,000.00

- Provide support of volunteers on the west side of the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area for improvements and management of the designated OHV Road, Trail and Area System. The OHV Host Program will provide a full time coordinator to support volunteers (hosts) and provide special outreach events. Hosts will also be trained to offer recreation and natural resource management information, provide educational programs, and help with fundraising events.

Technical Assistance Projects Underway or Pending

SLUPA provides training and technical assistance to local governments and other organizations regarding lands use, zoning and master plan-related topics. Due to the makeup of Nevada’s land ownership (management), being mostly public lands, topics on public lands are an important part of these efforts. The following is a current list of SLUPA projects either underway or requested:

- Joint Land Use Study: Nevada National Guard/North Las Vegas/Clark County
- I-80 corridor plan sponsored by NDOT
- Beatty Master Plan update.
- Esmeralda County subdivision ordinance, zoning ordinance and Master Plan update.
- Amargosa Valley Master Plan update and community facilitation.
- City of Caliente Master Plan update and community facilitation.
- Town of Austin Master Plan Update
- Kingston Land Use Plan Update
- Numerous training request for planning commissioners, county commissioners and planning staff

Publications

SLUPA publishes the “Laws Related to Planning” every two years, after each Legislative session. This comprehensive document is utilized by local jurisdictions, planning entities, consultants and many others as an invaluable planning tool. More than 600 copies of the 2008 edition have been sold.

Mr. Canfield concluded and asked for any questions.

Tom Fransway asked about Fire Safe Councils and how to establish a local chapter. He asked if SLUPA could provide assistance in forming a chapter or if the community should go directly through the Nevada Fire Safe Council. **Mr. Canfield** replied that the best way to handle that would be to contact Andrew List directly at the Nevada Fire Safe Council. Mt. Charleston has an active local chapter.

Jim Lawrence added that the USFS Spring Mountain district has completed a comprehensive fire plan. Funding through the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA) is available as a result of the White Pine County Conservation, Recreation and Development Act to support fire prevention and reduction activities in the Carson Range, Lake Tahoe and the Spring Mountains. To qualify for the funding, a fire management plan is required.

Pete Livermore asked about the potential closure of the Nevada State Prison and the status of the National Guard armory facility at Fairview and Carson Street. He asked what role NDSL plays in these issues. He also encouraged NDSL to work with Carson City on these matters. **Mr. Lawrence** responded that NDSL holds title to the properties but assigns, in most cases, management to other State agencies. NDSL’s State Land Office is responsible for land transactions that occur on State properties. NDSL also coordinates the process to identify future uses for vacant buildings with State Public Works and Buildings and Grounds. The armory facility is planned for demolition and clean-up but the funds for that purpose had to be reverted and are not currently in the budget due to the current economic situation. NDSL wants to see these properties actively managed and used to their highest and best State use. The Department of Public Safety has a

Nevada Division of State Lands

State Land Use Planning Agency
901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5003
Carson City, Nevada 89701-5246

Telephone: (775) 684-2723

Fax: (775) 684-2721

desire to move on to the site. Compared to other western states, there is not much State land in Nevada, as such, all existing properties are critical to maintain and utilize for future State uses. **Mr. Lawrence** emphasized that NDSL always wants to work with local governments on these issues.

LEGISLATIVE BILLS RELATED TO PLANNING

Skip Canfield, AICP summarized a report entitled *"Summary of Proposed Bills, Senate Concurrent Resolutions, and Bill Draft Requests for the 75th Regular Session of the Nevada Legislature"*. Each legislative session, SLUPA tracks all bills and bill draft requests (BDR's) that have relevancy to planning and natural resource-related issues, important to both the State and local jurisdictions. The report can be found on the SLUPA website (State Land Use Planning Advisory Council link) at www.lands.nv.gov.

LET'S REVIEW NEVADA LAND USE PLANNING

Michael A. Harper, FAICP, provided a presentation on the fundamentals of land use planning in Nevada.

Authority for planning in Nevada:

◆ **NRS 278.150 Master plan: Preparation and adoption by planning commission; adoption by governing body of city or county.**

1. The planning commission shall prepare and adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the city, county or region which in the commission's judgment bears relation to the planning thereof.

◆ **NRS 278.315 Granting of variances, special and conditional use permits and other special exceptions by board of adjustment, planning commission or hearing examiner....**

1. The governing body may provide by ordinance for the granting of variances, special use permits, conditional use permits or other special exceptions by the board of adjustment, the planning commission or a hearing examiner appointed pursuant to [NRS 278.262](#). The governing body may impose this duty entirely on the board, commission or examiner, respectively, or provide for the granting of enumerated categories of variances, special use permits, conditional use permits or special exceptions by the board, commission or examiner.

◆ **NRS 278**

- Regional planning
- Master planning
- Subdivisions
- Special Exceptions
- Vacations and Abandonments

◆ **NRS 278A**

- Planned Unit Development

◆ **NRS 278B**

- Impact Fees

◆ **NRS 268**

- Annexation

Players and their roles:

◆ **Multiple Players in the Planning Process**

- **Some identified by Nevada Revised Statutes**

◆ **Elected bodies**

◆ **Advisory bodies**

- Planning Commission
- Board of Adjustment
- Hearing Examiners
- Town Boards
- Citizen advisory committees

◆ **State and regional agencies**

- **Some identified by Local Codes**

- ◆ **Homeowner associations**
- ◆ **Some Roles are Quasi-Judicial**
 - Typically approval of an application
 - ◆ **Example:**
 - Special Use Permit for a particular use
 - Tentative Subdivision Map for new lots
- ◆ **Some Roles are Legislative**
 - Typically approval of a regulation
 - ◆ **Example:**
 - New regulations for wind energy
- ◆ **Some Roles are Policy**
 - Typically adoption of a plan
 - ◆ **Example:**
 - Updated master plan for a geographical area
- ◆ **Players in the Quasi-Judicial Role**
 - Elected bodies
 - Planning commissions
 - Boards of adjustment
 - Hearing examiner
 - Planning departments
 - State, regional & local Organizations
 - Citizen advisory bodies
 - CITIZENS
- ◆ **Players' Responsibilities**
 - Elected bodies
 - ◆ Final approval (sometimes just appeals)
 - **Planning Commission, Board of Adjustment, Hearing Examiner**
 - ◆ Application approval (sometimes final, unless appealed)
 - **Planning Department**
 - ◆ Application analysis; staff reports & recommendations; circulate application
 - **State/Regional/Local Organizations**
 - ◆ Application's comments & proposed draft conditions
 - **Citizen advisory bodies**
 - ◆ Application recommendations & gather citizen comments
 - **CITIZENS**
 - ◆ Testimony on applications
- ◆ **Players in the Legislative Role**
 - Elected Bodies
 - Planning Commission
 - Planning Department/Legal Counsel
 - State, Regional & Local Organizations
 - Citizen Advisory Bodies
 - CITIZENS
- ◆ **Player's Responsibilities**
 - Elected Body
 - ◆ Final approval of ordinances
 - **Planning Commission**
 - ◆ Recommendation on ordinances
 - **Planning Department/Legal Counsel**
 - ◆ Draft ordinances; staff report; circulate for comment
 - **State/Regional/Local organizations**
 - ◆ Comment on draft ordinances

- **Citizen Advisory Bodies**
 - ◆ Gather citizen comments & provide recommendations on draft ordinances
 - **CITIZENS**
- Testimony on draft ordinances
- ◆ **Players in the Policy Role**
 - **Elected Bodies**
 - **Planning Commission**
 - **Planning Department**
 - **Federal, State, Regional & Local Organizations**
 - **Citizen Advisory Bodies**

CITIZENS

- ◆ **Players' Responsibilities**
- Elected Body:**
Final adoption of plans
- Planning Commission:**
Preliminary adoption of plans
- Planning Department:**
Collaborate with citizens on plan creation; prepare final plan; circulate for comment
- Federal/State/County Agencies:**
Review & comment on draft plans
- Citizen Advisory Bodies:**
Plan creation assistance; citizen review forum; comment on & recommend final draft plans
- CITIZENS:**
Assist with plan creation; testimony on final plans

Typical Applications:

- ◆ Typical applications reviewed and acted upon by the Planning Commission
 - Master Plans and Amendments
 - Zone Changes
 - Subdivision Maps
 - Vacations and Abandonments
- ◆ Typical applications reviewed and acted upon by either the Planning Commission or the Board of Adjustment
 - Variances
 - Special Use Permits

Master Plans:

- ◆ No specific definition of comprehensive plan (general plan, master plan) in NRS
 - ◆ Closest definition: NRS 278.150 (preparation and adoption of master plan)
 - "...comprehensive, long-range plan for the physical development of the city, county, or region which...bears relation to the planning thereof."
 - Another definition:
- "The adopted official statement of ... a local government that sets forth (in words, maps, illustrations, and/or tables) goals, policies, and guidelines intended to direct the present and future physical, social, and economic development that occurs within its planning jurisdiction and that includes a unified physical design for the public and private development of land and water" Growing Smart Legislative Handbook, American Planning Association
- ◆ Four authorities for development of Comprehensive (Master) Plan
 - NRS 278.150-230: All portions of Nevada, except Washoe & Clark Co.s, & Lake Tahoe
 - NRS 278.0273-0288: Co.s 100K-400K (Washoe Co.)
 - NRS 278.02507-02598: Co.s over 400K (Clark Co.)
 - NRS 278.780-828: Lake Tahoe Basin

- Master Plan required for all counties over 40,000 population; all cities over 25,000 population
- Occurs because these jurisdictions required to have a planning commission and requirement of planning commission is to create a master plan
 - ◆ Planning commission must adopt the master plan
 - ◆ Except for counties over 100,000 population (and the municipalities within these counties), jurisdictions free to choose what elements in 278.160 they wish to include.
 - ◆ Clark County and cities in Clark County must adopt all elements
 - ◆ Washoe County and cities in Washoe County must adopt following elements which must be in conformance with Regional Plan:
 - Conservation
 - Housing
 - Population

Elements that are available for master plans

- ◆ Community Design
- ◆ Conservation
- ◆ Economic
- ◆ Historic Preservation
- ◆ Housing
- ◆ Land Use
- ◆ Population
- ◆ Public Buildings
- ◆ Public Services and Facilities
- ◆ Rural Neighborhood Preservation
- ◆ Safety
- ◆ School Facilities
- ◆ Seismic
- ◆ Solid Waste Disposal
- ◆ Streets and Highways
- ◆ Transit
- ◆ Transportation

Master Plan Amendments:

- ◆ No more than 4 amendments per year
 - Exception: less than 25% of area (area not defined in NRS)
- ◆ Planning Commission must adopt
 - Newspaper notice 10 days before public hearing
 - 2/3 of total membership to approve plan or amendment
- ◆ Governing Body can adopt (mandatory for Clark and Washoe Counties and cities within these counties)
 - Newspaper notice 10 days before public hearing
 - Proposed change must be reviewed by planning commission for report
 - ◆ Referred changes must be specific
 - ◆ 40 day review by planning commission, or time period waived by governing body
 - Majority of total membership to approve plan or amendment

Zone Changes:

- ◆ NRS 278.250: Identifies 14 issues that zoning is designed to address, e.g.
 - Conservation of air and water
 - Views and access
 - Character & physical limitation of land
 - Adequate supply of housing
- ◆ No requirement in NRS to adopt zoning as a tool to implement a master plan

- NRS clearly permits zoning as a tool, but does not mandate it

◆ NRS 278.260:

“The governing body shall provide for the manner in which zoning regulations and restrictions and the boundaries of zoning districts are determined, established, enforced and amended.”

Adoption and Amendment of Zoning Ordinance Regulations:

- 10 day notice in newspaper (excluding date of hearing) of new or amended regulation
- If regulation has specific effect on property within 300 feet of mobile home park, 10 day notice by mail
- Regulation cannot become effective until 5 days after transmittal of adopted regulation to unincorporated town board
 - ◆ Clark County, only

Adoption and Amendment of Zoning District Maps:

Noticing requirements divided between Counties (and their jurisdictions) under and over 100,000 population

- ◆ Further division between Washoe and Clark Counties
- ◆ Under 100,000 population
 - 10 day mailed notice to applicant requesting action (excluding date of public hearing)
 - 10 day mailed notice to all property owners within 300 feet of boundary(ies) of subject property and military installation within 3,000 feet
 - 30 separate property owners must be noticed, no matter how distant from subject property
 - 10 day mailed notice to advisory board established by governing body
 - Electronic notice to above, if requested (and can be verified)
 - If “down zoning”, section of notice permitting property owners to provide their comments required
- ◆ Between 100,000 and 400,000 population
 - Same as under 100,000 population; notice area expanded to 750 feet
 - Pre-hearing with notice to the community in which property is located prior to public hearing on application
- ◆ Over 400,000 population
 - Same as 100,000 – 400,000 population; following additions
 - ◆ Notice must identify purpose of notice; sign posted on subject property stating change of zoning being requested
 - ◆ If unincorporated property surrounded by city is subject of amendment, all city recommendations not supported by county require written response
 - ◆ If more than 20% of responses to “down zoning” object, no action permitted unless
 - Each comment considered; written finding that public interest promoted by change
- ◆ Governing body must take action on zoning ordinances and district maps, including amendments
- ◆ Typically, planning commissions are recommending body
- ◆ Hearing Examiner can be assigned responsibility of making a recommendation

Zoning Changes/Amendments:

- ◆ NRS 278.250 requires zoning to be consistent with master plan for land use
- ◆ There are exceptions to NRS 278.250 language
 - Court has opined that zoning did not have to be in strict conformance with master plan (Nova Horizon, Inc. v City Council, Reno)
 - Nevada Attorney General has opined: zoning ordinances don’t need to be immediately amended to conform to changed master plan, and zoning regulations remain in effect until amended.

- When approving tentative subdivision map, zoning trumps master plan if conflict occurs
 - ◆ Exception is Washoe County – mandatory conformance of regulations with master plan

Subdivisions:

- NRS does not distinguish between jurisdictions
- NRS does distinguish between types of plats
 - ◆ Parcel map
 - ◆ Subdivision map
 - ◆ Map of Division into Large Parcels

Subdivision Maps:

- ◆ Most commonly known by public
 - 5 or more lots
 - Typical review for
 - ◆ Service provision
 - ◆ Design
 - ◆ Environmental issues
 - Required 2 step process
 - ◆ Tentative map: preliminary plat
 - ◆ Final map: final plat, conditions of approval met or assured
 - Processing
 - ◆ 45 days: Counties 400,000+ population
 - ◆ 60 days: Counties under 400,000 population
 - Delegation of review & approval
 - ◆ Tentative map: governing body or planning commission
 - ◆ Final map: governing body, planning commission, planning director
 - Tentative map valid for initial 2 years
 - ◆ All or portion must be recorded within 2 years
 - Extension of time
 - ◆ 1 year extension may be granted
 - ◆ Within 2 years of extension, all or portion must be recorded

Parcel Maps:

- ◆ Popular method for owners of single parcels
 - 4 lots or fewer
 - Tentative map and/ or final map
 - Delegation of review:
 - ◆ Elected body
 - ◆ Planning Commission
 - ◆ Committee
 - ◆ Planning Director
 - Processing
 - ◆ 45 days: Counties 400,000+ population
 - ◆ 60 days: Counties under 400,000 population
 - Valid for 1 year, only (unless jurisdiction chooses 2 year option)
 - Emerging Trend
 - ◆ 4 X 4
 - ◆ NRS option to consider subsequent parcel maps as subdivision maps

Maps of Division Into Large Parcels:

- ◆ NV may be only state to have this process
 - Division of land into 40 acre or greater parcels, or 1/16 of a section
 - ◆ 1/16 of a section could result in less than 40 acre parcel
 - ◆ Unlimited number of these types of parcels
 - Limited Review
 - ◆ Access
 - ◆ Easement retention or replacement
 - Two step process:
 - ◆ Tentative map: design
 - ◆ Final map: final plat, retention or relocation easements
 - Processing
 - ◆ 45 days: Counties 400,000+ population
 - ◆ 60 days: Counties under 400,000 population
 - Delegation of Review
 - ◆ Tentative and final maps: governing body, planning commission, planning director

Exemptions and Industrial Subdivisions:

- ◆ EXEMPTIONS
 - Each platting section of NRS lists exemptions, e.g.
 - ◆ Cemetery lots
 - ◆ Court-ordered divisions of land
- ◆ INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISIONS
 - ◆ Not exempt from subdividing process
 - ◆ Exempt from identifying lot design and layout
 - ◆ Must show street pattern

Vacations & Abandonments:

Two processes

- Independent, or part of a subdivision process
- ◆ Government abandonment/vacation is only of jurisdiction's interest in easement, street, etc.
- ◆ Distribution of abandoned/vacated area determined by how street/easement obtained
 - If dedicated: amount of land equally distributed to adjoining property owners
 - If purchased: land offered for sale to adjoining property owners
- ◆ Process:
 - Requires notification of adjoining property owners/interested parties and public utilities and cable TV
 - Vacation/abandonment must be beneficial to public; if approved, reservation of easement for public utilities/cable TV required if requested

Special Exceptions:

- ◆ Variances and Special Use Permits
 - NRS categorizes both as special exceptions
 - Different rules for both, though
 - Different objectives
 - ◆ Variance: Exemption to a standard
 - (NRS does NOT authorize use variances; few states do)
 - ◆ Special Use Permit: Use requiring some type of special review
 - Special exceptions usually reviewed by two groups
 - ◆ Technical staff

- Comments tend to be focused on physical issues
- ◆ Advisory bodies
 - Comments tend to be focused on effects of application on area

Variances:

- Can be heard by Planning Commission, Board of Adjustment or Hearing Examiner
- Can be acted upon finally by Planning Commission, Board of Adjustment or Hearing Officer if authorized by governing body
 - ◆ Appeal to governing body must be provided
- Findings for approval established in NRS
 - ◆ Hardship is primary finding, very narrowly defined
 - ◆ Shape of lot, topography of land which create strict compliance with standards difficult or impossible
- Application requirements: locally determined; Noticing: NRS
 - ◆ Counties under 100,000 population (mailed notice)
 - Applicant; property owner (300 feet of subject parcel), tenants manufactured home park (300 feet of subject parcel), military installation (3,000 feet of subject parcel)
 - ◆ Counties over 100,000 population (mailed notice)
 - Deviation under 30%: applicant; property owner (100 feet of subject parcel), tenants manufactured home park (100 feet of subject parcel), military installation (3,000 feet of subject parcel)
 - ◆ Counties over 100,000 population (2) (mailed notice)
 - Deviation over 30%: applicant; property owner (500 feet of subject parcel), tenants manufactured home park (500 feet of subject parcel); military installation (3,000 feet of subject parcel); 30 separate property owners
 - ◆ Notice: received 10 days prior to hearing date (excluding date of hearing)
 - ◆ Public hearing: within 65 days of submittal
- Conditions of approval
 - ◆ Must be rationally related to impact of variance
 - ◆ Almost always on-site
- Effect of variance
 - ◆ Related, only, to development that requires variance
 - ◆ Not typically extended to another development application
 - A variance granted for a garage extending into the front setback would not typically be extended for an expansion of the main dwelling into the same front setback at a later date
 - Check with local jurisdiction to determine if this policy is followed

Special Use Permits

(aka Conditional Use Permits):

- Can be heard by Planning Commission, Board of Adjustment or Hearing Examiner
- Can be acted upon finally by Planning Commission, Board of Adjustment or Hearing Officer if authorized by governing body
 - ◆ Appeal to governing body must be provided
- Not uncommon for uses in separate zoning categories to be treated differently,
 - ◆ One zone may require a special use permit for a use, another zone may allow the same use by right
- Use requiring special use permit must be identified in development regulations
- Application requirements: locally determined; Noticing: NRS
 - ◆ Counties under 100,000 population (mailed notice)

- Applicant; property owner (300 feet of subject parcel), tenants-manufactured home park (300 feet of subject parcel), military installation (3,000 feet of subject parcel)
- ◆ Counties 100,000 to 400,000 population (mailed notice)
 - Applicant; property owner (500 feet of subject parcel), tenants-manufactured home park (500 feet of subject parcel); military installation (3,000 feet of subject parcel); 30 separate property owners
- ◆ Counties over 400,000 population (mailed notice)
 - Applicant; property owner (500 feet of subject parcel), tenants-manufactured home park (500 feet of subject parcel); military installation (3,000 feet of subject parcel); 30 separate property owners; physical posting of property; notice of unincorporated town boards
- ◆ Notice: received 10 days prior to hearing date (excluding date of hearing)
- ◆ Public hearing: within 65 days of submittal
- Findings for approval not established in NRS
- Typical findings used by local government
 - ◆ Need
 - ◆ No detriment
- Conditions of approval
 - ◆ Must be rationally related to impact of variance
 - ◆ May be both on-site and off-site
 - Depends on identified impacts
 - ◆ May be operational
 - Hours of operation, lighting, etc.
- Effect of Special Use Permit
 - ◆ Related, only, to use that requires use permit
 - ◆ May extend to permitting ancillary uses related to primary use
 - Check with local jurisdiction to determine if this policy is followed

LUNCH BREAK

Chairman Mancebo adjourned the meeting for lunch at 12:00 pm.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Chairman Mancebo reconvened the meeting at 1:10 pm.

THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Alice Baldrice provided the following presentation:

- SHPO: the State Historic Preservation Office.
- One for each state and territory
- Also: tribal historic preservation officers.
- Part state funded and part federally funded.
- Functions defined in statutes and law.

State Historic Preservation Plan:

- The Plan guides the program.
- Done every 8 years.
- Based on research, public meetings and questionnaires.
- Describes state of knowledge on historic properties.
- Discusses challenges and opportunities.
- Establishes goals and objectives, priorities for funding.

National Register Program:

- Nation's list of most important archaeological and historic objects, sites, buildings, structures, engineering works and districts.
- 50 years of age, have integrity and meet one or more of the following criteria:
- Administered by National Park Service.
- Nationally: over 80,000 entries in Register, 2,400 National Historic Landmarks.
- Nevada has almost 350 National Register properties and six NHLs.

Criteria for Listing:

- a. are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- b. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- c. embody distinctive characteristics, are of high artistic value, work of a master or that represent a significant entity whose components lack individual distinction; or
- d. that have yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

Section 106 Projects:

- Commenting on projects that are federally funded, permitted/licensed, or that take place on federal land.
- Projects include gold mines, highways, senior centers, fuels management, dams, flood control projects.
- Four step process:
 1. Assist federal agency in identifying potential consulting parties.
 2. Establish an Area of Potential Effect and determine level of identification.
 3. Review and comment on determinations of eligibility.
 4. Review and comment on determinations of effect.

HPF Grants:

- HPF Grants available on 60/40 matching basis on annual basis -- \$200 k.
- Grants available for planning, pre-development, survey, inventory and National Register nominations.
- Work must meet Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Survey and Inventory:

- Surveys result from Section 106 identification. Not driven by research or preservation needs.
- Surveys are also conducted under HPF grants by local governments.
- Approximately 7,000 architectural records; 69,000 archaeological sites.
- Last year: 770 architectural properties added to inventory; 1,333 archaeological sites.

Certified Local Governments:

Must have ordinance to recognize and protect historic properties; must have qualified historic resources commission.

- Storey County/Virginia City
- Reno
- Carson City
- Las Vegas

Tax Act Program:

- Can work to revitalize a historic community.
- Provides a 20% tax credit for certified rehabilitation of certified historic structures.
- Tax credits lower the amount of income subject to taxation.

- Only one or two applications a year in Nevada.
- Could be cornerstone for redevelopment.

Public Education:

- Historic Preservation/Archaeological Awareness Month – May each year
- Presentations
- Press releases
- “Houses with a History” and other programs

Site Stewardship Program – A State Funded Program (2005):

- Educate the public.
- Coordinate and train site stewards.
 - 12 regional coordinators
 - Over 460 site stewards
- Work with federal and state agencies.
- Create and maintain list of priorities for monitoring.

Commission for Cultural Affairs Grants (1991):

- CCA grants for cultural centers in historic structures: \$3 million per year.
- Properties must be owned by local gov't or non-profit.
- Applicants must follow Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Historic Markers – Also State Funded (1977):

- Coordinate with NDOT.
- Over 260 markers statewide usually on roadside.
- Educate the public with appropriate text.
- Repair and place new markers as appropriate.

Protection of Native American Burials – A State Law (1989):

- Provide for appropriate management and treatment of newly discovered NA remains and burial sites.
- Work with property owner and tribes.
- Work with county coroner and local law enforcement.
- Prosecution for deliberate damage or trafficking in human remains.

Centennial Ranch Program – A State Program of Recognition:

- Recognition of ranches owned and operated by the same family for over 100 years.

Comstock Historic District:

- Designated by State of Nevada in 1969.
- Intended to protect the historic integrity of the architectural and historic buildings of Virginia City, Gold Hill, Silver City and Dayton.
- Created a commission to govern rehabilitation and alterations.

Ms. Baldrica asked if there were any questions on her presentation.

Bill Whitney asked about historic landmarks. **Ms. Baldrica** responded that there are six, and include Ft. Churchill, Ft. Ruby, Virginia City, Hoover Dam, and two archaeological sites.

Sheri Eklund-Brown asked about the stewardship program and if all of the important sites in Nevada would be GPS'd. **Ms. Baldrica** responded that there are 69,000 archaeological sites in Nevada. Of those, 350 are

on the National Register. SHPO works with the federal and state agencies to determine the priorities for the sites for monitoring and protection. Many of the sites being monitored are being vandalized, and many of those sites are near Las Vegas. **Ms. Eklund-Brown** asked how sensitive sites are protected where development or degradation is occurring. **Ms. Baldrice** responded that in the case where the site will be lost to development (e.g. mining company leach pad), the company pays for data recovery. In some cases, (e.g. new road), if the site is very sensitive, the road location design may be altered to protect the site.

COUNTY PLANNING ISSUES

Chairman Mancebo asked each of the SLUPAC members to report on planning related activities within their areas of representation.

Nancy Lipski, Clark County:

The Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition is focusing on sustainability.

The Southern Nevada Water Authority is working on a grant program to provide citizens the opportunity for home inspections to determine level of energy efficiency.

Also, the County is working on ways to revamp the development code (building and planning), to provide for sustainability.

The County is looking at a program of waivers for alternative energy projects.

Sheri Eklund-Brown, Elko County:

The County is working with NDEP on some recent impaired water listings (Humboldt Basin). Would like to move toward a more standardized testing example like Idaho or Oregon. This would coordinate testing that is done by different agencies following different standards and using different equipment.

The County is a cooperating agency with the US Forest Service travel management plan process. There is a concern about the potential closure of user-created and RS2477 roads. A huge issue is how the process will designate roads on public lands beyond private lands. Many roads currently traverse private land prior to the public lands, and these are used for access. **Mr. Whitney** commented that Washoe County has all RS2477 roads GPS'd and on GIS layer. This information is supplied to the US Forest Service. Reno and Sparks are also involved and the intent is for everyone to use the same maps.

The County supports the Cortez Hills Mine expansion and the economic activity the expansion will bring.

The transload railport facility will break ground in March and construction should be completed by Fall. A marketing plan will be completed as soon as possible.

The bronze elephant sculpture at the California Trail Interpretive Center was unveiled. The County is still \$3 million short in funds for the exhibits.

The possibility of the UNR Fire Science Academy closure is a huge issue.

An analysis on wilderness fire use was completed. An example noted was a US Forest Service burn on 50 acres that ballooned into 3000 acres with a \$9 million cost. A fire review was done and more coordination with the federal agencies is being encouraged for future controlled burns in wilderness areas.

Eleanor Lockwood, Churchill County:

The Master Plan is in need of update and there will be an emphasis on engaging the public. The first workshop has been held and it focused on accomplishments such as open space and agricultural preservation. Regarding encroachment, approximately \$4 million has been utilized by the Navy to purchase conservation easements on 1,000 acres of agricultural land around NAS Fallon. Typically, the water rights stay on the property.

There is geothermal development and exploration occurring in a number of locations.

Lahontan Reservoir is almost empty. The drought will be horrible for farming this summer unless substantial precipitation occurs.

Varlin Higbee, Lincoln County:

LS Power is in the process of putting a power line through the county.

Developers on projects north of Mesquite are concerned about tax bills on lands that are not being improved due to the slow economy. The zoning has been granted and the new tax rates assessed, however, they are unable at this time to commence projects, and the tax bill is a hardship to them.

The Lincoln County Public Lands Policy Plan is being updated with assistance from the State Land Use Planning Agency.

The Parks and Open Space plans are being updated.

Title 13 is being updated.

The County addressing project is complete.

Micky Yarbrow, Lander County:

Geothermal exploration and drilling is ongoing.

Geothermal exploration ongoing.

New well being drilled for Battle Mt. to address the arsenic issue.

Austin Master Plan being updated with the assistance of the State Land Use Planning Agency.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral County:

Travel management plan - US Forest Service road closure and mapping discrepancy concerns.

Hawthorne area should be pursued as a solar energy area.

Potential land fill planned at Rawhide.

The Hawthorne Depot training facility is having a difficult time obtaining the necessary permits for off-site training from the US Forest Service and BLM.

Butch Borasky, Nye County:

CCA detention facility has been approved in Pahrump.

Working on Great Basin College land acquisition in Pahrump.

Working on creation of a new water authority.

Manhattan arsenic mitigation plan being developed. Needed also for Round Mt. and Hadley.

Midway Gold right-of-way work underway.

Don Tibbals, Lyon County:

Silver Springs master plan and Smith Valley master plan have been completed by community-based planning efforts.

New milk plant is open.

Tom Fransway, Humboldt County:

The Question 1 Bike/Hike Trail on Winnemucca Mountain will have construction begin this spring.

River Walk is progressing.

Water Canyon (Thomas Fire) rehab has been completed.

County is coordinating with BLM on the RMP update.

50 MEG Blue Mountain geothermal plant is coming on line.

County concern about frivolous lawsuits being filed by Western Watersheds. The counties and State need a more aggressive stance opposing these actions.

First county Special Assessment District for road projects (south side of Winnemucca) was voter-approved.

Working with NDOT on interchange project and safety project on highway 95, high truck traffic issue.

Dealing with "checkerboards" lands mineral rights and access issue. Resolution is to apply these lands to the division of large parcels process through a jurat, and make the disclosure so that the public is aware of the concerns and issues on those lands.

Bill Whitney, Washoe County

The Reno Triple A baseball stadium should be open by Fall. Big component of Reno's downtown redevelopment effort. There is a commercial component as well.

Legends at Sparks Marina development is ongoing.

Multi-year flood control project continuing.

Wind projects being reviewed for Pah Rah Range (Virginia Peak Wind has a special use permit submitted since it is on private land) and another proposal near Virginia City on BLM. Large issue is placement of roads and transmission lines. **Micky Yarbro** asked if noise is an issue for nearby residents. **Mr. Whitney** responded that the existing code will regulate noise, as well as the fact that the turbines are over a ridge and fairly far away from the nearest home.

County conducted a successful public workshop on wind power as it relates to adjacent residential uses. So successful, a solar workshop is planned.

Juan Guzman, Carson City:

Working on the development of the Carson River Whitewater Aquatic trail.

Federal stimulus package needed for Carson City for the freeway, V&T Railroad project, the airport and the community center.

Senate has approved the Carson City Vital Community Act, on to the House. Act consolidated public lands in a more manageable way.

Parks projects underway including new fishing pond at Fuji Park.

Wilson Trust property is the first Legacy project.

Conservation easements at Horse Creek Meadow (Q1 project).

Serpa Lands along the Carson River being acquired through a partnership with Nevada Land Conservancy, Q1 and Carson City.

Anderson property acquisition along the Carson River.

Robert Conner, Douglas County:

Very minimal building going on in the county.

Large commercial project on hold near Topsy Lane.

The Park Cattle Company master plan amendment was denied by the Planning Commission and County Commission.

Clustering ordinance finalized.

Update to the floodplain ordinance.

New FEMA maps have data discrepancy concerns.

Board passed an increase in the number of multi-family units per acre to bring the development ordinance in line with the master plan.

Robin Bell, White Pine County:

Fire and Ice event was held at Cave Lake.

County Commissioners have approved the land use plan.

BLM Record of Decision granting rights-of-way for LS Power transmission line.

BLM FEIS for Steptoe Valley coal-fired power plant. Second plant under review also.

County upgrading all of the fire stations in the fire district and there is a new fire chief.

USGS conducting a study on the waters in Great Basin National Park and its connections to Snake Valley and the proposed pumping involved with SNWA project

Dewatering issue at the Robinson Mine, may be affecting other water users. Potential for mine closure, loss of 500 jobs.

Senator Reid is pursuing a change in the air quality class at Great Basin National Park from Class 2 to Class 1. This could affect mining and other activities that create dust.

Grazing permittees have a concern about wildlife guzzlers being located in a way that benefits the wildlife at the expense of livestock.

The water database is being updated to determine that data's connection to land use planning.

Nevada Division of State Lands

State Land Use Planning Agency
901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5003
Carson City, Nevada 89701-5246

Telephone: (775) 684-2723

Fax: (775) 684-2721

Roger Mancebo, Pershing County:

Four mines are attempting to open but are delayed by the permitting process, both federal and state. County is looking into forming a local public land use advisory council.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (None)

COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS **Tom Fransway** and other members commended **Bill Whitney** for his years of service on the Council. **Mr. Whitney** is being replaced by **John Breternitz**, Washoe County Commissioner.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Regarding possible up-coming agenda items, **Vice-Chairman Sheri Eklund-Brown** suggested a discussion of the BLM/US Forest Service land disposal process (Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act) and how to facilitate the process in a quicker manner.

Eleanor Lockwood and **Robert Connor** requested a discussion on the activities and role of the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection's Air Quality Section.

Pete Livermore requested a discussion on planning and renewable energy and the State Energy division. He suggested an invitation be given to NV Energy and the Public Utilities Commission (Mark Harris).

Robin Bell suggested a discussion on land subsidence due to water withdrawals in Spring Valley.

FUTURE MEETING CONSIDERATIONS

ADJOURN FOR A FIELD TRIP TO CARSON RIVER

Due to the lateness of the meeting, the field trip was cancelled. Instead, **Juan Guzman** and **Kevin Hill** provided a brief update on activities along the river associated with Carson City Open Space Program and the State's Question 1 Program. A map was displayed that showed the efforts so far that have resulted in acquisition of many parcels along the river. Additional parcels are being pursued, jointly via Carson City Open Space funds, Q1 funds, as well as Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA) funds.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Skip Canfield, AICP, Senior Planner
Meeting Recorder

Please note that minutes should be considered draft minutes pending their approval at a future meeting of the State Land Use Planning Advisory Council. Corrections and changes could be made before approval.

The meeting was digitally recorded. Anyone wishing to receive or review the recording may call (775) 684-2723. The recording will be retained for three years.